

Medieval Byzantine chant and the sound of Orthodoxy

Alexander Lingas

Orthodox Christian critics of Latin Christianity have rarely limited themselves to the complex theological and ecclesiological matters¹ that have preoccupied official interchurch dialogues from the Council of Ferrara-Florence to the present. They have instead often attacked Westerners for diverging from their own received ritual or disciplinary practices, fidelity to which they have seen as markers of doctrinal orthodoxy.² The Council in Trullo's (691-2) pre-schism condemnations of mandatory clerical celibacy and fasting on Saturdays in the Church of Rome were, as Tia Kolbaba has recently shown, expanded during the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries to cover a broad spectrum of topics. These range from the moral failings of individuals to a host of customs that might arguably be classified more charitably as admissible markers of cultural difference: for example the liturgical use of unleavened bread, shaving by priests, the wearing of rings by bishops, and burial practices.³ Later writers drop some of these items, but more

¹ Eg, the *Filioque* and papal primacy.

² Similar manifestations of intolerance, of course, were not unknown in the West. They also became an internal problem for Orthodoxy in the seventeenth century with Patriarch Nikon's reforms of the Russian Church.

³ T.M. Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists: Errors of the Latins* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000); and eadem, 'Byzantine perceptions of latin religious "errors": themes and Changes from 850 to 1350', in A.E. Laiou, ed. and R.P. Mottahedeh, *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 2001), 117-43.

than compensate for them by adding others, including liturgical drama,⁴ Gothic architecture⁵ and even the modern environmental crisis.⁶

Given this broadening over time of anti-Latin⁷ theological polemics into a more general anti-Westernism,⁸ it should not be surprising that some Orthodox view the ways in which their liturgical music differs from that of Western Christianity as theologically significant. Thus Orthodox writers today routinely chide Westerners for their introduction of 'worldly' instruments into Christian worship, innovations which they contrast with the heavenly sobriety of traditional *a cappella* singing.⁹ Partisans of monophonic chant often go a step further, adding to the lists of Latin Christianity's errors polyphony and harmony,¹⁰ techniques which

⁴ Symeon of Thessalonica, *Dialogus contra haereses*, PG 155.112–17.

⁵ C. Yannaras, *The Freedom of Morality*, trans. E. Brière (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1984), 231–64.

⁶ P. Sherrard, *The Rape of Man and Nature: An Enquiry into the Origins and Consequences of Modern Science* (Ipswich: Golgonooza, 1987). Robert Taft's observation (*Beyond East and West*, 2nd rev. edn. (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2001), 69–70) about modern Orthodox writers making unfair comparisons between their own ideals and Roman Catholics realities would seem to apply also to environmental issues, especially when one considers the problem of pollution in Greece and the Orthodox lands of Eastern Europe.

⁷ Throughout this paper I will use 'Latin' and 'the Latins' as generic terms referring to pre-modern Western Christians of diverse ethnic origins that owed ecclesiastical allegiance to the Roman Papacy and whose worship (of whatever local rite) was conducted in Latin. I do so mainly for reasons of convenience (which also apply to my use of 'Byzantines' for people who called themselves 'Rhomaioi'), fully recognising that monolithic views of the Latin West were, as Alexander Kazhdan has noted, rare in Byzantium before the twelfth century. See 'Latins and Franks in Byzantium: perception and reality from the eleventh to the twelfth century', in Laiou, ed. and Mottahedeh, *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, 83–100.

⁸ A good introduction to this topic is V.N. Makrides and D. Uffelmann, 'Studying eastern orthodox anti-westernism: the need for a comparative research agenda', in J. Sutton, ed. and W. van den Bercken, *Orthodox Christianity and Contemporary Europe* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 87–120. Robert Taft has noted a tendency of some modern Orthodox writers to make unfair comparisons between their own ideals and Roman Catholics realities; see n. 6, above.

⁹ C. Cavarnos, *Byzantine Chant: A Sequel to the Monograph Byzantine Sacred Music containing a Concise Discussion of the Origin of Byzantine Chant, its Modes, Tempo, Notation, Prologoi, Prosomoia Style and Other Features* (Belmont, MA: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1998), 21–24. Most of Cavarnos' chapter consists of an extended quote from his own translation of selected writings of Photis Kontoglou (C. Cavarnos, *Byzantine Sacred Art: Selected Writings of the Contemporary Greek Icon Painter Fotis Kontoglou* (Belmont, MA: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1985), 153–54), the flavour of which can be discerned from the following excerpt: 'The Western Church, in order to gratify people and flatter their tastes, put instruments inside the churches, disobeying what was ordained by the Fathers. ...They did this because they had no idea what liturgical music was and what secular music was, just as they did not know the difference between liturgical painting and secular painting' (22–24).

¹⁰ Eg. C. Cavarnos, *Byzantine Sacred Music: The Traditional Music of the Orthodox Church, Its Nature, Purpose and Execution* (Belmont, MA: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek

traditionalist Greek cantors say stand in marked contrast to the musical traditions of medieval Christianity (if not ancient Greece)¹¹ that they faithfully preserve.¹² Echoes of these critiques may even be discerned in the quasi-oracular pronouncements of contemporary British composer Sir John Tavener, who regularly juxtaposes the music of a Western 'culture in ruins' with what he perceives, not always with the greatest discernment, to be the ancient repertoires of Orthodox chant.¹³

Studies, 1974), 17–20; idem, *Byzantine Chant*, 25–26; and Yannaras, 261. Orthodox whose received repertoires are still dominated by the harmonised 'Court chant' of the Imperial Chapel in St. Petersburg have (for obvious reasons) been unwilling to go so far. See, for example, the ambivalent comparison of plainchant and harmonised choral music in a booklet published by the Department of Liturgical Music of the Orthodox Church in America: *Sacred Music: Its Nature and Function*, Tract 1 ([Syosset, NY], 1977), 4–8.

¹¹ As I have discussed elsewhere (A. Lingas, 'Modern Greek sacred music and the invocation of the past', unpublished paper presented to the IMS Intercongressional Symposium 'The past in the present' in Budapest on 26 August 2000), it has been common since the nineteenth century for Greek authors to trace their received traditions of Byzantine chanting to the music of ancient Greece. For an English version of this narrative, see P.S. Antonellis, *Byzantine Church Music: Its History and Modern Development* (Athens, 1956), 205.

¹² One finds Greek (as well as Western) writers of the last 150 years expressing a variety of opinions regarding how much has been preserved unchanged. Some of the strongest survivalist claims have been associated with the 'Stenographic Theory' of medieval Byzantine notation. Articulated in its classic form by Konstantinos Psachos (d. 1949) in his monograph *Η Παρασημαντική τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Μουσικῆς* (Athens, 1917; 2nd edn, Athens, 1978), it attributes the apparent differences between medieval and modern neumations of particular chants to changes in notational conventions. Specifically, this theory holds that medieval scribes generally used notation in a stenographic manner to record only the intervallic outline of a chant (its 'metrophonia'), while its *melos* or true melody as heard in performance was revealed only by post-Byzantine copyists who employed the same neumes in progressively more 'analytical' ways until definitive versions were recorded during the first decades of the nineteenth century in the reformed notation (the 'New Method') of the Three Teachers (Chrysanthos of Madytos, Chourmouzios the Archivist and Gregorios the Protopsaltes). On the debates between traditionalist Greek and (mainly) Western scholars, see A. Lingas, 'Performance practice and the politics of transcribing Byzantine chant,' *Acta Musicae Byzantinae* 6 (2003), 56–76. An accessible and more nuanced exposition of the stenographic theory by Grigoris Stathis, its leading contemporary champion, is 'An analysis of the sticheron *Tὸν ἥλιον κρύβαντα* by Germanos, Bishop of New Patras (The old "Synoptic" and the new "Analytical" method of Byzantine notation', in M. Velimirović, ed., *Studies in Eastern Chant* 4 (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1979), 177–227.

¹³ J. Tavener, 'The sacred in art', in I. Moody, ed., *Contemporary Music and Religion*, Contemporary Music Review 12, Part 2 (1995): 49–54. Despite his avowed intention to recover 'sacred tradition', Tavener has on several occasions set melodies by the Westernising cantor and erstwhile reformer of Byzantine chant John Sakellarides (d. 1938). For a brief introduction to the life and work of Sakellarides, see A. Lingas, 'Sakellarides, John', in G. Speake, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Greece and the Hellenic Tradition* (London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2000), II, 1482–83.

For the modern historian seeking to locate medieval Byzantine chant culturally, the task of creating narratives unburdened by such confessional polemics is further complicated by the very nature of music. As a number of writers have observed,¹⁴ although a specimen of musical notation may be treated as an historical text subject to the usual philological methods of textual criticism, music also remains a performative activity physically producing sounds of finite duration. Prior to the invention of modern recording equipment, it was possible to reproduce performances only inexactly through various combinations of musical notation and oral transmission. While the advent of recordings has not only created new questions surrounding musical works' ontology (e.g. 'what is the relationship of a particular recorded performance to "the work itself"?'?), it has also exacerbated some of the problems surrounding the interpretation of pre-modern repertoires for which contemporary sound documents are lacking. Confident, polished and (to their audiences) aesthetically satisfying performances by respected musicians that are disseminated through live repetition and mechanical reproduction can, as Richard Taruskin has observed, acquire a kind of spurious authority as the 'authentic' sound of a particular historical repertory regardless of interpretive choices that are at best speculative and at worst demonstrably anachronistic or otherwise historically inaccurate.¹⁵

The relevance of Taruskin's observations on the dangers of aural presuppositions to questions of musical Orthodoxy will become apparent below as I reconsider medieval and modern views of the relative cultural positions of Byzantine liturgical music and its Western Christian siblings during the Middle Ages. Since the conclusions advanced by some of Byzantine musicology's modern pioneers continue to circulate widely in reference works and non-specialist literature, I shall begin by summarising their influential models of East-West musical relations. I will then briefly reconsider this question in the light of modern research, suggesting that Byzantine chanting through the end of the fifteenth century remained, broadly speaking, stylistically and aesthetically compatible with what were statistically the most common types of contemporary Western liturgical singing.

¹⁴ Efforts to grapple with the ontology of music and its implications for musical historiography include C. Dahlhaus, *Foundations of Music History*, trans. J.B. Robinson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); L. Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992); Leo Tretter, *Music and the Historical Imagination* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989); and Richard Taruskin, *Text and Act: Essays on Music and Performance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

¹⁵ Taruskin, 'The modern sound of early music', in *idem, Text and Act*, 164–72.

Early Attempts to Locate the Cultural Position of Byzantine Chant

Despite their antipathy to obvious incursions of Western musical elements into their received traditions of chanting,¹⁶ even modern Greek Orthodoxy's most committed opponents of polyphony have conceded that the musical traditions of Greek and Latin Christianity were originally compatible. Thus George I. Papadopoulos, who in 1890 ended his massive and still influential history of Byzantine music from 'apostolic times to our own days' with a chapter entitled 'The Replacement of Our Ecclesiastical Music by European Tetraphony is Impossible',¹⁷ not only affirms that the 'earliest European music was closely related to the Greek', but that it was actually of Greek origin.¹⁸

Modern Western musicologists, as Leo Treitler has observed, generally prefer not to trace the origins of Western art music to ancient Greece in so direct a fashion as Papadopoulos.¹⁹ Nevertheless, even scholars whose views have conflicted strongly and publicly with those of Greek traditionalists – for example, the founders of the *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae* of Copenhagen, Western academia's flagship organisation for the scholarly study of Byzantine chant – have generally affirmed Papadopoulos' point regarding the closeness of Greek and Latin liturgical singing during the first millennium and their divergence in the second. A particularly bold instance of such concurrence is found in H.J.W. Tillyard's 1935 guide to medieval Byzantine notation, the first chapter of

¹⁶ As Kaiti Romanou has observed, certain key elements of the 'New Method' of Byzantine notation created in early nineteenth-century Constantinople by the 'Three Teachers' (Chrysanthos of Madytos, Chourmouzios the Archivist and Gregorios the Protopsaltes) were borrowed from the West but successfully disguised, thereby forestalling the intense opposition that had defeated two earlier attempts at musical reform by Agapios Paliermos. See K. Romanou, 'A new approach to the work of Chrysanthos of Madytos: the new method of musical notation in the Greek church', in D. Conomos, ed., *Studies in Eastern Chant* 5 (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1990), 90–94.

¹⁷ Συμβουλαὶ ἐκ τῆς παρὰ ἡμῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῆς μουσικῆς καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν χρόνων ἀχρὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἡμῶν ἀκμάσαντες ἐπιφανέστεροι μελῳδοὶ, ὑμνογράφοι, μουσικοὶ καὶ μουσικολόγοι (Athens, 1890; repr. 1977), 499–538.

¹⁸ Papadopoulos, *Συμβουλαὶ*, 174; and more recently, Ph. A. Oikonomou, *Βυζαντινὴ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ μουσικὴ καὶ φωλμαῷδα ἱστορικομουσικολογικὴ* μελέτη (Aigion, 1992), 102 and 162.

¹⁹ L. Treitler, 'The politics of reception: Tailoring the present as the fulfilment of a desired past', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 116 (1991), 280–98. On the other hand, it is worth noting that Donald J. Grout and Claude V. Palisca's popular textbook *History of Western Music*, 6th edn (New York: Norton, 2001) precedes its discussion of medieval Latin plainchant with sections on Ancient Greece, Christian antiquity and Byzantine chant.

which begins with the sentence 'Byzantine Music in its main features resembles Gregorian'.²⁰

Tillyard's colleague and collaborator Egon Wellesz – whose *History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography* continues to be cited today as an authoritative reference-work despite the profound changes in scholarly perspective evident from the much shorter introduction to the field printed in the revised *New Grove Dictionary*²¹ – devoted an entire monograph to the question of Greek-Latin musical relations: the now largely outdated *Eastern Elements in Western Chant*.²² A Roman Catholic composer of polyphonic masses,²³ Wellesz came closest to the views of his Greek antagonists when he conceded that the cultivation of multi-part singing – upon whose 'development ... Western musicians concentrated their activity after the end of the eleventh century'²⁴ – constituted a departure from early Christianity's shared inheritance of monophonic chant.²⁵ Wellesz, however, also believed naïvely that Gregorian chant, despite its gradual replacement within worship by other forms of music, had 'been kept unchanged by the Western Catholic Church',²⁶ when in fact its form and manner of performance had changed numerous times, most recently with the 'restoration' of medieval Gregorian melodies spearheaded by the monks of Solesmes.²⁷

The necessary corollary to Wellesz's belief in the perpetual purity of Western plainchant was a typically Orientalist narrative of decline for its Greek counterpart. Wellesz therefore maintained that Byzantine chant

²⁰ A *Handbook of the Middle Byzantine Notation*, MMB Subsidia 1 (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1935), 13.

²¹ K. Levy and C. Troelsgård, 'Byzantine Chant', in S. Sadie, ed. and J. Tyrell, *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, rev. edn, (London: Macmillan, 2001), IV, 734–56.

²² MMB Subsidia 2 (Boston, 1947). In his recent article 'Methodological problems in comparative studies of liturgical chant' in R.F. Taft, ed. and G. Winkler, *Acts of the International Congress Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872–1948)*, Rome, 25–29 September 1998, OCA 265 (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2001)), Christian Troelsgård describes *Eastern Elements in Western Chant* as being 'more suited as a catalogue of inspiration than of reliable results' (p. 983).

²³ Eg. the *Mass in F Minor for Soprano, Alto, Tenor and Bass with Organ Accompaniment*, op. 51 (London: Lengnick, 1949) and the unaccompanied *Missa Brevis*, op. 89 (Münster: Gregorius-Musikverlag, 1964).

²⁴ *Eastern Elements*, 186.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 186–91.

²⁶ E. Wellesz, 'Music of the eastern churches', in Dom A. Hughes, ed., *The New Oxford History of Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954), II, 18.

²⁷ Wellesz was not unaware of change in Latin plainchant, but evidently viewed it as having been negated by the Solesmes' restoration of the earliest recoverable melodies. This may be seen, for example, in his concurrence with Solesmes' view that Gregorian chant had originally been sung in 'free rhythm' and his attribution of the decline of Latin plainchant to 'the influence of rhythmical secular music' (*Eastern Elements*, 190–91).

was beset by decadence during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when it was allegedly overcome by 'superficial figuration which completely obscured the original melodic structure'.²⁸ What Tillyard called 'the growing influence of the East'²⁹ throughout the late and post-Byzantine periods was seen as the primary agent in the creation of the received tradition of Byzantine chanting. Accordingly, the drone or *ison* heard in modern performances was probably also 'a late importation from the East' that represented a departure from an allegedly strict medieval tradition of monophony.³⁰ Wellesz did not approve of these developments, indicating this most clearly by his unwillingness to apply the appellation 'Byzantine' to the received tradition, calling it instead 'Neo-Greek ecclesiastical music'.³¹

As I have shown elsewhere in some detail,³² Tillyard and Wellesz's rejection of the received Byzantine tradition's authenticity and their decision to identify closely its medieval forebear with Gregorian chant as restored and sonically re-envisioned in the late nineteenth century by the monks of Solesmes³³ was partially due to a series of methodological errors. Most of these, including confusion of Solesmes' palaeographic achievement with its aurally authoritative performing style, stemmed from their naïve approach to the gap between musical notation and its realisation in sound, which today is the focus of the musicological sub-discipline known as 'performance (or performing) practice'.³⁴ Yet even

²⁸ Wellesz, 'Music of the eastern churches', 17.

²⁹ A Handbook, 15.

³⁰ H.J.W. Tillyard, *Twenty Canons from the Trinity Hirmologium*, MMB Transcripta IV (Boston: The Byzantine Institute, 1952), 5.

³¹ Wellesz, 'Music of the eastern churches', 17–18.

³² A. Lingas, 'Performance practice and the politics of transcribing Byzantine chant', *Acta Musicae Byzantinae* 6 (2003), 56–76.

³³ On the canonic status acquired by Dom Mocquereau's approach to the performance of Gregorian chant, see M. Berry, 'The restoration of the chant and seventy-five years of recording', *Early Music* 7 (1979): 197–217; and L.W. Brunner, 'The performance of plainchant: some preliminary observations of the new era', *Early Music* 10 (1982): 317–28. A cultural history of the Solesmes restoration is K. Bergeron, *Decadent Enchantments: The Revival of Gregorian Chant at Solesmes* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

³⁴ See Lingas, 'Performance practice', esp. 58–61 and 64–73. Thrasybulos Georgiades was the first to criticise the founders of the MMB for their insensitivity to issues of performance practice in his devastating article 'Bemerkungen zur Erforschung der byzantinischen Kirchenmusik', BZ 39 (1939), 67–88. On the current state of the field, see H.M. Brown, D. Hiley, et al., 'Performing practice', in S. Sadie, ed. and J. Tyrrell, *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, XIX, 349–88. In the portion of this article (I., 2) devoted to sacred Western monophony (350–52), David Hiley states categorically that 'there is no evidence that Latin singers ever used the *ison* or drone note of late Byzantine chant' (352), citing as evidence Nowacki's refutation of Jammers' earlier hypothesis that the 'paraphonistae' mentioned in Roman manuscripts might have been drone-holders. There is, however, later evidence from elsewhere in medieval Europe that drones were sometimes

more important for understanding early scholars' views regarding the relative cultural positions through history of Byzantine and Latin church music, however, was the antipathy prevalent in Western (and Westernised Greek) musical circles of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries for the *sound* of traditional Greek chanting. Greek traditionalists, as we have already noted above, matched this negative sentiment by vigorously asserting the historical continuity of Byzantine chant and denouncing any attempt to reform or replace it as a betrayal of Hellenism and Orthodoxy.

The internal disputes between traditionalist and Westernising factions of the Greek Orthodox Church over liturgical music were frequent, public and bitter enough to receive the collective name of 'The Musical Question' ('Τὸ μουσικὸν ζήτημα').³⁵ Abroad, where wholehearted defenders of the received tradition of Byzantine chanting were understandably fewer in number, negative appraisals of it appear to have been the norm. This can be seen, for example, in the following excerpts from commentary the scholar and Roman Catholic choirmaster Sir Richard R. Terry offered in 1909 to accompany a demonstration of Byzantine music by some of his singers:

I must ask you not to smile at the singing, because the effect of hearing this music for the first time with trained English voices is curious. When you hear the regular Arab singing it is much as if a person were holding his nose and howling. Even Dr. Fortescue, in his book, calls it caterwauling.

... My own experience is that when Oriental singers get to the upper notes of the scale, it is generally difficult to know what they are trying to sing. In any case the chromatic melodies sound weird when listened to for the first time. Most of my friends – after I have given them a bar or two – say 'Thank you' with such fervent emphasis that it clearly indicates they have had enough. The Gramophone Company asked me to give them three records of this Byzantine music, and when the first had been duly recorded, the courteous secretary also said 'Thank you' with equal

used in liturgical performances: eg. the three types of 'polyphony' labeled 'basilica' in the treatise known as the *Summa Musice*. See C. Page, ed. and trans., *The Summa Musice: A Thirteenth-Century Manual for Singers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 30–32 [commentary], 125–26 [translation], 200–02 [text]; and E. Gerson-Kiwi, Drone and 'Dyaphonia basilica', *Yearbook of the International Folk Music Council*, 4 (1972), 9–22.

³⁵ Recent and relatively dispassionate historical surveys of these debates are Y. Filopoulos, *Εἰσαγωγὴ στὴν Ἑλληνικὴ πολυφωνικὴ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ μουσικὴ* (Athens, 1990), 26–151; and K. Romanou, *'Ἐθνικῆς Μουσικῆς Περιήγησις 1901–1912; Ἑλληνικὰ μουσικὰ περιοδικά ὡς πηγὴ ἐρευνας τῆς ἴστορίας τῆς Νεοελληνικῆς Μουσικῆς* (Athens, 1996), I, 31–95.

fervour, and opined that one such record in their catalogue would be as much as the philistine British public would stand.³⁶

The Cultural Position of Byzantine Music in the Light of Recent Scholarship

Many of the positions held by Byzantine musicology's founders have been modified in the light of investigations of previously understudied repertoires and increasingly frequent contacts between Greek and Western scholars conducted over the last half century. Although a full account of these advances is beyond the scope of this present article,³⁷ it is possible to provide here a brief account of their development. During the 1950s and early 1960s work began in earnest on the melismatic chants for the Byzantine Divine Office and eucharistic liturgies contained in the Psaltikon and Asmatikón, collections of, respectively, solo and choral chants employed both in the Cathedral Rite of Hagia Sophia and in monasteries of the Stoudite tradition.³⁸ Studies of later counterparts to these 'classic' florid repertoires in Akolouthiai manuscripts paved the way for direct confrontations with the allegedly decadent music of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in the form of Edward V. Williams' surveys of St John Koukouzeles' music for vespers, which rehabilitated previously maligned works as harbingers of a 'Byzantine *ars nova*'.³⁹ Subsequent major studies of other neglected late Byzantine repertoires by Conomos⁴⁰ and Touliatos⁴¹ were complemented on the one hand by

³⁶ R.R. Terry, 'The music of the Byzantine liturgy', *Proceedings of the Musical Association*, 35th Sess. (1908–1909), 58 and 65–66. Cf. A. Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1907), 411–12.

³⁷ For a brief account, see Lingas, 'Performance Practice', 74–76. An extensive general bibliography is appended to Levy and Troelsgård, 'Byzantine Chant', 748–56.

³⁸ Eg. C. Floros, 'Das Kontakion', *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 34 (1960), 84–106; K. Levy, 'The Byzantine Sanctus and its modal tradition in East and West', *Annales Musicologiques* 6 (1958–63), 7–67; idem, 'A Hymn for Thursday in Holy Week', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 16 (1963), 127–75; and C. Thodberg, *Der byzantinische Alleluiaionzyklus: Studien im kurzen Psaltikonstil*, MMB Subsidia 7 (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1966).

³⁹ E.V. Williams, 'A Byzantine *Ars Nova*: the 14th-century reforms of John Koukouzeles in the chanting of Great Vespers', in H. Birnbaum, ed. and S. Vryonis, Jr., *Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change: Contributions to the International Balkan Conference held at UCLA, October 23–28, 1969* (The Hague: Mouton, 1972), 211–29.

⁴⁰ D. Conomos, *Byzantine Cherubika and Trisagia in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1974); idem, *The Late Byzantine and Slavonic Communion Cycle: Liturgy and Music* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1985).

⁴¹ D. Touliatos-Banker, *The Byzantine Amemos Chant of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1984).

continued work on the Asmatikon and Psaltikon,⁴² and on the other by systematic explorations of sources from the period between the Ottoman conquest of 1453 and the advent of the 'New Method', the reformed Byzantine notation of the 'Three Teachers' that was officially adopted by the Ecumenical Patriarchate in 1814 and still in use today.⁴³ Greek scholars including Simon Karas,⁴⁴ Markos Dragoumis,⁴⁵ Manolis Chatzigiakoumis⁴⁶ and the prolific Gregorios Stathis, who has also supervised a number of important doctoral theses at the University of Athens' recently founded Department of Music,⁴⁷ have done much to foster a better understanding of post-Byzantine chant. The extent of change in Byzantine music – especially with regard to rhythm, chromaticism and ornamentation, elements that were recorded with much less precision in pre-Chrysanthine notation – through the centuries remains in dispute, but it is now clear that the chanting heard in most parts of Greece, the Balkans and the Middle East is not an invention of the Three Teachers, but part of a continuous tradition reaching back into the Middle Ages.⁴⁸

⁴² Eg. G. Hintze, *Das byzantinische Prokeimena-Repertoire* (Hamburg: Wagner, 1973); N.K. Moran, *The Ordinary Chants of the Byzantine Mass* (Hamburg: Wagner, 1975); S. Harris, ed., *The Communion Chants of the Thirteenth-Century Asmatikon* (Amsterdam: Harwood, 1999).

⁴³ On the introduction of the New Method, see Romanou, 'A new approach', 94. In 1881, a committee of the Ecumenical Patriarchate made minor changes to the system of the Three Teachers. The authority of the revised New Method was recently confirmed by the Holy Synod of Greece's Committee for Ecclesiastical Art and Music: Archimandrite S. Michalakis, 'Η Ἑκκλησιαστικὴ Βυζαντινὴ Μουσικὴ καὶ τὸ ἀνάφεν «Μουσικολογικὸ ζήτημα»', available on-line at http://www.ecclesia.gr/greek/holysynod/committees/art/art_mysic.htm (accessed 4 December 2004).

⁴⁴ His most thorough discussion of post-Byzantine music is S. Karas, *Μέθοδος τῆς ἑλληνικῆς μουσικῆς: Θεωρητικόν* (Athens, 1982), 2 vols.

⁴⁵ An important early contribution was 'The survival of Byzantine chant in the monophonic music of the modern Greek church', in M. Velimirovic, ed., *Studies in Eastern Chant 1* (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), 9–36.

⁴⁶ Of particular importance is his lavishly illustrated catalogue *Χειρόγραφα Ἑκκλησιαστικῆς μουσικῆς (1453–1820)* (Athens, 1980). The recent re-publication of the influential historical introduction to this work as a separate book was marked by the appearance of an important review of it in *Μουσικὸς Λόγος* 3 (2001), 226–30 by Ioannis Plenomenos, who argues that Chatzagiakoumis overstated the importance of the Ecumenical Patriarchate as a musical centre during the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

⁴⁷ For a full account of the work undertaken by Stathis and his students, see A. Chaldaikakis, ed., *Τιμὴ πρὸς τὸν διδάσκαλον: Ἐκφραση ἀγάπης στὸ πρώστοπο τοῦ κάθηγητον Γρηγορίου Θ. Στάθη* (Athens, 2001).

⁴⁸ This new consensus is reflected both in the title and individual essays of C. Troelsgård, ed., *Byzantine Chant: Tradition and Reform, Acts of a Meeting held at the Danish Institute at Athens, 1993*, Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens 2 (Athens: Danish Institute at Athens, 1997).

Musicologists together with liturgists have similarly done much to refine earlier views of musical relations between the Byzantine East and Latin West, particularly during the first millennium A.D. The formation in Late Antiquity of the systems of Christian worship known today as 'rites' initially created a kind of unity in diversity, from among which scholars have discovered a host of variations on such archetypal forms and patterns as the Eucharist and the daily cycle of prayer that may be broadly distinguished from one another according to language, region of origin and suitability for urban or monastic use.⁴⁹ Within these bounds, which were largely coterminous geographically and socially with those of the Roman Empire during the fourth and early fifth centuries, the practices of spiritually or culturally important centres often exercised a formative influence on worship elsewhere, leading to complex patterns of borrowing between rites. Items and practices of liturgical or devotional song were prominent among the elements of worship exchanged between monasteries and cities on the one hand, and different regions of the Empire on the other.

An outstanding example of such interchange is the rapid diffusion of biblical psalm-singing from the deserts of Egypt to urban and monastic communities throughout the Mediterranean basin, a process which McKinnon has characterised as a 'psalmody movement'.⁵⁰ Unfortunately, no instances of notated psalmody survive from this period, but the ease with which psalmody practices spread across linguistic and geographic barriers – of which Augustine's famous report in the *Confessions* of the Milanese church's recent adoption of antiphonal singing 'after the manner of the eastern regions' is but a single instance⁵¹ – would seem to presuppose a certain level of musical compatibility across the empire's Christian churches, something that should not be unexpected within the context of a politically unified Mediterranean. Such a conclusion is, at the very least, not contradicted by the fact that disputes over liturgical or devotional singing in Late Antiquity focused on such universal issues as

⁴⁹ On the formation of Christian liturgical rites, see R.F. Taft, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 24–25.

⁵⁰ J. McKinnon, 'Desert monasticism and the later fourth-century psalmody movement', *Music and Letters* 75 (1994): 505–21; repr. as Chap. XI in *idem, The Temple, the Church Fathers and Early Western Chant* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998).

⁵¹ Quoted as No. 351 in J. McKinnon, ed. and trans., *Music in Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) [henceforth MECL].

the spiritual utility of musically interesting psalmody,⁵² the need to keep order within the assembly,⁵³ and the place of non-scriptural hymnody.⁵⁴

The degree to which the entire Mediterranean remained a culturally and socially distinct entity in the centuries after the fall of the Western Roman Empire is an issue that has been much debated in recent years.⁵⁵ For our present purposes, it will be sufficient for us to note that the musical traditions of the Greek East and the Latin West evidently remained sufficiently compatible to allow for a modicum of exchange and even mutual appreciation well into the second millennium AD. This may be seen first in the Eastern hymns and responsorial psalms – mostly adapted to Latin, but in a few instances left in their original Greek⁵⁶ – that were incorporated into the liturgical repertoires of Rome, Milan, Benevento, Spain and Gall during the sixth, seventh and eighth centuries.⁵⁷

Western enthusiasm for Greek musical traditions seems initially not to have been affected significantly by the souring of relations between West and East during the later eighth and ninth centuries over such issues as political precedence and iconodule theology. Around the year 800, for example, Carolingian theorists adopted the Byzantine system of eight

⁵² McKinnon, 'Desert monasticism', 516–19.

⁵³ In addition to Canons 15, 17 and 23 of the Council of Laodicea (MECL Nos. 255–57), see Niceta of Remesiana's instructions for congregational singing in *De utilitate hymnorum* (MECL No. 311).

⁵⁴ A fourth-century witness to differing opinions over the propriety of non-scriptural hymnody is the prohibition of 'privately composed psalms' ('ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμούς') in the Council of Laodicea's Canon 59 (MECL No. 261). For the subsequent history of such disputes, see now S. Frøyshov, 'La reticence à l'hymnographie chez des anachorètes de l'Égypte et du Sinaï du 5ème au 8ème siècles', in A. M. Triacca, ed., and A. Pistoia, *L'Hymnographie, Conférences Saint-Serge XLVIIe Semaine d'Études Liturgiques Paris, 29 Juin–2 Juillet 1999, Ephemerides Liturgicae Subsidia* 105 (Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 229–45.

⁵⁵ A recent and broad-based attempt to address historically the question of Mediterranean distinctiveness with extensive bibliography is P. Horden and N. Purcell, *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000). For an overview of the problem of 'Mediterraneanness' in contemporary music, see the essays in G. Plastino, ed., *Mediterranean Mosaic: Popular Music and Global Sounds* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003).

⁵⁶ Eg., the *Improperia* for Good Friday, the Old Roman Alleluias for Easter Week and the bilingual Greek-Latin chants of the Beneventan repertory.

⁵⁷ For a recent bibliography of Byzantine-Western musical relations concentrating on the first millennium, see Troelsgård, 'Methodological Problems', 993–96. Due to its prestige as a centre of pilgrimage, Jerusalem seems to have played a pivotal role in the dissemination of elements drawn from the repertoires of Eastern Christian chant. See P. Jeffrey, 'The lost chant tradition of early christian Jerusalem: some possible melodic survivals in the Byzantine and Latin chant repertoires', *Early Music History* 11 (1992), 151–90; R. Thoonen Dubowchik, 'A Jerusalem chant for the Holy Cross in the Byzantine, Latin and Easter rites', *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 5 (1996), 113–29.

musical modes known as the Octoechos as a tool for the systematisation of Gregorian chant.⁵⁸ Notker Balbulus reports in the *Gesta Caroli Magni* that Charlemagne, after hearing some Byzantine 'antiphons' for the octave of Epiphany, ordered their translation into Latin, a tale verified through comparative study with by Oliver Strunk.⁵⁹ A further manifestation of Frankish interest in Byzantine liturgy was the compilation of the *Missa graeca*, a Roman mass with its ordinary and, in a few manuscripts, some of its proper chants in Greek.⁶⁰

Although Westerners evidently had ceased borrowing from Byzantine musical traditions by the end of the first millennium AD, the extant sources indicate that Byzantine and Latin Christians generally remained tolerant of – and, occasionally, even enthusiastic about – each other's liturgical music. In the tenth century it is interesting to note that Liudprand of Cremona, while complaining about virtually every aspect of Byzantine society, did not object to the imperial acclamations he heard for musical reasons, but only to what he saw as the empty flattery of their texts.⁶¹ Odo of Deuil's description of Byzantine singing in the mid-twelfth century is thoroughly positive, noting that the Greek clergy

... made a favourable impression because of their sweet chanting; for the mingling of voices, the heavier with the light, the eunuch's, namely, with the manly voice (for many of them were eunuchs), softened the hearts of the Franks. Also they gave the onlookers pleasure by their graceful bearing and gentle clapping of hands and genuflections.⁶²

⁵⁸ P. Jeffrey, 'The earliest Oktoechoi: the role of Jerusalem and Palestine in the beginnings of modal ordering', in P. Jeffrey, ed., *The Study of Medieval Chant: Paths and Bridges, East and West in Honor of Kenneth Levy* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), 148–77. On the intonation formulas, see M. Huglo, 'L'introduction en Occident des formules byzantines d'intonation', in M. Velimirovic, ed., *Studies in Eastern Chant 3* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 81–90; and T. Bailey, *The Intonation Formulas of Western Chant* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1974).

⁵⁹ O. Strunk, 'The Latin antiphons for the octave of the Epiphany', chap. in idem, *Essays on Music in the Byzantine World* (New York: Norton, 1977), 208–19. Strunk identified the Latin antiphons *Veterem hominem* and *Caput draconis* as adaptations of, respectively, the fifth and sixth heirmoi of St Andrew of Crete's Canon for Epiphany. On the dating of the Latin translations, see C.M. Atkinson, 'Further thoughts on the origin of the *Missa graeca*', in P. Cahn, ed. and A. Heimer, *De Musica et cantu, Studien zur Geschichte der Kirchenmusik und der Oper. Helmut Hucke zum 60. Geburtstag* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1993), 81.

⁶⁰ On the *Missa graeca*, see M. Huglo, 'Les chants de la *Missa graeca* de Saint-Denis', in J. Westrup, ed., *Essays Presented to Egon Wellesz* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966), 74–83; Levy, 'The Byzantine sanctus'; and Atkinson, 'Further thoughts', 75–93.

⁶¹ 'Liutprand's report of his mission to Constantinople', in E.F. Henderson, ed. and trans., *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages* (London: George Bell, 1905), 446–7.

⁶² Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VI in orientem – The Journey of Louis VII to the East*, ed. and trans., V.G. Berry (New York: Norton, 1948), 69.

Appreciation for Byzantine chanting is also suggested by an episode in the vita of St Neilos the Calabrian (910–1004) describing the saint's reception of an invitation to celebrate a Greek all-night vigil (*agrypnia*) in honour of St Benedict at the Abbey of Montecassino.⁶³

Byzantine reports of musical contacts from the period between the mutual excommunications of 1054 to the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204 are generally free from the hostility to Western Christians evident in so much contemporary writing.⁶⁴ The only complaint about music in the lists of Latin 'errors' studied by Kolbaba concerns the Roman practice of abstaining from the chanting of Alleluia during fasts, rather than Western liturgical music *per se*.⁶⁵ A response by the canonist John, Bishop of Kitros (late twelfth-early thirteenth century) to a question about the propriety of Romaic Orthodox being buried in Latin churches or vice-versa with services chanted by both Greeks and Latins presents music, as Michael Adamis has previously noted,⁶⁶ as still an area of agreement between the two Christian churches. Bishop John begins his answer by listing the *Filioque* and the use of unleavened bread as the two major points of dispute, after which he says that the chanted texts and their melodies (*ai μελωδίαι*) are held in common by the two traditions, noting further that Latin psalmody is not foreign (*ἡ ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς φαλμωδία οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθνική*).⁶⁷ Another witness to musical compatibility from about the same time is the historian John Kinnamos, who reports in his chronicle that the Emperor Manuel Komnenos was received in Hungary by Latin clergy and laity that 'in the most harmonious way (*ἐμμελῶς*) chanted a sacred hymn' by one of 'our composers'.⁶⁸

The emotionally charged accounts of Latin conquest by Eustathius of Thessalonica and Nicetas Choniates include decidedly less happy musical

⁶³ Nun Maxime, ed. and trans., *Ο ὄσιος Νεῖλος ὁ Καλαβρός: Ο βίος τοῦ ὄσιου Νείλου τοῦ Νέου (910–1004)*, 2nd edn (Ormylia, 2002), 324–27.

⁶⁴ For an overview, see the following essays in A.E. Laiou, ed. and R. Parviz Motahedeh, *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 2001); Kazhdan, 'Latins and Franks', 83–100; E. Jeffreys and M. Jeffreys, 'The "Wild Beast from the West": Immediate Literary Reactions to the Second Crusade', 101–16; and T.M. Kolbaba, 'Byzantine Perceptions of Latin Religious "Errors"', 117–43.

⁶⁵ Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, 48 and 193.

⁶⁶ 'A reference to the relation of Eastern and Western chant', in M. Velimirović, ed., *Studies in Eastern Chant 4* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1979), 3–4.

⁶⁷ John of Kitros, 'Ἀποκρίσεις πρὸς Κωνσταντίνον ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Δυρράχιου τὸν Καβάσιλαν', in G. A. Rhales and M. Potles, *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν Κανόνων* (Athens, 1855), V, 403–04.

⁶⁸ *Historiae L. V*, 8, quoted and translated in B. Schartau, "Testimonia" of Byzantine musical practice, chiefly collected from non-musical (literary) sources, III', CIMAGL 68 (1998), 55. Schartau (61) has identified the hymn in question has a sticheron for the fourth week of Lent from the *Triodion*.

encounters with Western Christians. Eustathius' description of the Norman sack and occupation of Thessalonica in 1185 includes passages recalling boorish attempts to disrupt Greek services,⁶⁹ while Choniates' account of the Fourth Crusade describes the conquerors as pitiless and unmoved by tears or sweet singing.⁷⁰ Yet neither the further poisoning of Greek-Latin relations by the Crusades nor the increasing stylistic distance between the elite compositional genres of Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox liturgical music – measured polyphony and kalophonic chant, respectively – were apparently sufficient in and of themselves to bring about the total estrangement of the two musical traditions. Even a notorious Latinophobe like St Symeon of Thessalonica (d. 1429), whose critiques of a broad range of Roman Catholic practices display knowledge extending well beyond the usual Byzantine complaints about azymes and the recitation of the *Filioque* to encompass, among other things, liturgical dramas⁷¹ and baptismal formulas,⁷² never attacks Latin singing. This is even more remarkable when one considers that St Symeon possessed a level of musical sophistication sufficient to write hymns and mandate the chanting of settings by particular composers in his unpublished *Typikon* for Thessalonica's cathedral.⁷³

Writing a couple of decades after St Symeon, Sylvester Syropoulos describes in his anti-unionist account of the Council of Ferrara–Florence (1438–39) numerous encounters with Western ceremonial and liturgical music, none of them unfavourable.⁷⁴ The closest Syropoulos comes to

⁶⁹ Quoted in Schartau, 'Testimonia', 56–7.

⁷⁰ Quoted in *ibid.*, 58.

⁷¹ *Contra haereses* (PG 155.112–17).

⁷² *De sacramentis* (PG 155.228–30).

⁷³ Eg. MS Athens 2047, f. 147v, where he requires the chanting of a Polyeleos by Koukoumas. For a general survey of Symeon's liturgical works, see I. Phountoules, *Tὸ λειτουργικὸν ἔργον Συμεὼν τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης* (Thessalonica, 1966). On Symeon and music see A. Lingas, *Sunday Matins in the Byzantine Cathedral Rite: Music and Liturgy*, Ph.D. diss., University of British Columbia 1996, 191–278 (a revised and expanded version of this study is forthcoming from Ashgate Publishing).

⁷⁴ At first sight, this statement would appear to be contradicted by an extremely negative description of Latin music-making in a fifteenth-century Russian polemic against the Council of Florence quoted by Dimitri Conomos in two articles ('Experimental polyphony', 1–2; and 'Music as religious propaganda: Venetian polyphony and a Byzantine response to the Council of Florence', in J. Behr, ed., A. Louth and D. Conomos, *Abba: The Tradition of Orthodoxy in the West: Festschrift for Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 2003), 114). Indeed, Conomos presents this passage – taken, with a few unnoted modifications, including the omission of the word 'Emperor' in the first sentence, from N. Zernov, *Moscow the Third Rome*, 2nd edn (London: SPCK, 1938; repr. New York, 1971), 37 – as 'typify[ing] the prevailing negative Orthodox attitude to Western Christianity' ('Experimental Polyphony', 1). On the other hand, in both articles Conomos casts some doubt on the credibility of this source by remarking that one 'can only wonder in which

criticism of Latin singing is in his description of the concluding service of union on 6 July 1439, in which he notes that the Latin cantors (*ψάλται*) at one point sang some celebratory songs (*ἀσματαν τινὰ εὐχαριστήρια*) that seemed harmonious but incomprehensible to the Byzantines (*ἥμιν δὲ ὡς ἀσημοι ἐδόκουν φωναὶ ἐμμελεῖς*),⁷⁵ possibly a reference to an elaborate polytextual motet or other advanced piece of mensural polyphony such as those written for Pope Eugenius IV by Guillaume Dufay. Although Vespasiano da Bisticci praises the dignified vestments of the Greeks in his rapturous account of the same event,⁷⁶ none of the Western sources offer specific aesthetic judgements of the Byzantines' musical contributions to the union service.⁷⁷

In the highly contentious atmosphere of the Paleologan period, the absence of Greek polemics against Latin liturgical music such as those advanced by modern Orthodox authors music is significant but obviously not sufficient to prove that the two musical cultures remained in some sense stylistically compatible. Positive proof, however, may be found in the existence of two-part polyphony in medieval Byzantine notation,

Florentine church the writer had such an experience!' ('Experimental Polyphony', 2; 'Music as Religious Propaganda', 114).

The doubts implicit in Conomos' latter comment are substantiated by further investigation. The attack on Latin liturgical music, which Zernov presented only in translation and without precisely identifying its source, does not appear in either of the two Russian eyewitness accounts of the Florentine council: the anonymous and relatively even-handed *Journey to the Council of Florence*; and the polemical *Tale of the Council of Florence* by the Monk Simeon. It comes instead from pages 373–74 of the anonymous *Oration Selected from the Holy Writings (Slovo izbrano ot sviatykh pisaniy)*, in A.N. Popov, ed., *Istoriko-literaturnyy obzor drevnerusskikh polemicheskikh sochineniy protiv Latiniyan, XI–XV vv.* (Moscow, 1875; repr. with an introduction by I. Dujčev, London: Variorum, 1972, 360–95), a mid-fifteenth century polemic combining elements of the Monk Simeon's *Tale* with the accounts of Russian chroniclers who, according John Fennell (*A History of the Russian Church to 1448* (London and New York: Longman, 1995), 181), were 'only too inclined to magnify the sterling Orthodoxy of [Grand Prince] Vasily [III]'.

⁷⁵ V. Laurent, ed., *Les 'Mémoires' du Grand Ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence (1438–1439)*, Concilium Florentinum documenta et scriptores, series B, vol. 9 (Rome: Pontificium institutum orientalium studiorum, 1971), 498.

⁷⁶ Summarised in J. Gill, S.J., *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 293–4. On the reception of the Byzantine delegation in Italy, see Jean Décarreaux, *Les Grecs au concile de l'union Ferrare-Florence 1438–1439* (Paris: Picard, 1969).

⁷⁷ Eg. the *Diary of Geminiani Inghirami*, which records only that 'after the litany the Greeks chanted songs of praise according to their custom (Greci cantaverunt certas laudes more ipsorum)', in G. Hofmann, ed., *Fragmenta protocolli, diaria privata, Concilium Florentinum documenta et scriptores, series A*, vol. 3, part 2 (Rome: Pontificium institutum orientalium studiorum, 1951), 36.

examples of which were first described in 1971 by Michael Adamis.⁷⁸ At first these were viewed as isolated compositional experiments by Latinophiles,⁷⁹ but it has become increasingly clear that they represent written traces of the adoption by several prominent Byzantine musicians – including Manuel Chrysaphes, Lampadarios of the Royal Clergy and arguably the fifteenth century's leading composer of Greek Orthodox chant⁸⁰ – of contemporary Western forms of simple and usually improvised chant-based polyphony sometimes called *cantus planus binatim*.⁸¹ Virtually ignored in traditional progressivist narratives of Western art music's development from allegedly 'elementary' monophony to Schoenberg, simple polyphony and the vast repertoires of Western plainchant are now known to have been statistically much more prevalent in Latin Christendom during the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries than elite forms of notated mensural polyphony.⁸² Viewed in this context, Byzantine polyphonic practices of the fifteenth century may now be seen as forming the missing link between earlier traditions of medieval Byzantine chanting and the musical repertoires and polyphonic practices of Venetian Crete, elements of which survive today in the chant traditions of the Ionian Islands.⁸³

⁷⁸ M. Adamis, 'An example of polyphony in Byzantine music of the late middle ages', in H. Glahn, ed., S. Sørensen and P. Ryom, *Report of the Eleventh International Musicological Society Congress, Copenhagen, 1971* (Copenhagen: Hansson, 1972), II, 737–47.

⁷⁹ Conomos, 'Experimental Polyphony'.

⁸⁰ G. Stathis, '«Διπλοῦν Μέλος». Μία παρουσίαση τῶν περτώσεων «Λατινικῆς Μουσικῆς» στὰ χειρόγραφα βυζαντινῆς μουσικῆς' in Chaldaikis, ed., *Τιμὴ πρὸς τὸν διδάσκαλον*, 656–74.

⁸¹ P. Weincke, 'Harmonic texture in Byzantine and early Italian polyphony', in *Musica Antiqua VII: Acta Scientifica* (Bydgoszcz, 1985), 219–43.

⁸² Eg., see C. Corsi, ed. and P. Petrobelli, *Le polifonie primitive in Friuli e in Europa: Atti del congresso internazionale Cividale di Friuli, 22–24 Agosto 1980* (Rome: Edizioni torre d'Orfeo, 1989); T.F. Kelly, ed., *Plain song in the Age of Polyphony* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); R. Strohm, *The Rise of European Music, 1380–1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 321–39; R.C. Wegman, 'From maker to composer: Improvisation and musical authorship in the Low Countries, 1450–1500', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 49 (1996), 409–79; M. Bent, 'The musical stanzas in Martin Le Franc's *Le Champion des Dames*', in J. Haines, ed. and R. Rosenfeld, *Music and Medieval Manuscripts: Paleography and Performance, Essays dedicated to Andrew Hughes* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 91–127.

⁸³ M. Ph. Dragoumis, 'Η δυτικίζουσα ἐκκλησιαστική μουσική μας στὴν Κρήτη καὶ στὰ Επτάνησα', *Λαογραφία* 31 (1976–78), 272–93; idem, *Η μουσικὴ παράδοση τῆς Ζακύνθου ἡ ἐκκλησιαστική* (Athens, 2000); D. Touliatos-Miles, 'The Application of "Chant sur le Livre" to Byzantine chant: An examination of polyphony in Byzantine chant', *Acta Musicae Byzantinae* 6 (2003), 43–49; Nikolaos M. Panagiotakes, 'Μαρτυρίες γιὰ τὴ μουσικὴ στὴν Κρήτη κατὰ τὴ Βενετοκρατία', *Thesaurismata* 20 (1990), 9–169; I. Arvanitis 'Η βυζαντινὴ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ μουσικὴ παράδοση στὴ μεταβυζαντινὴ Κέρκυρα', in *Πρακτικὰ τοῦ αυνεδρίου ἱστορίας τῆς ἐπτανησιακῆς μουσικῆς (Αγροστόλι-Ληχούρι*

Not only was the adoption of Western polyphonic practices by some Byzantine cantors during the fifteenth century apparently accepted without official protests, but also tolerance by ethnic Greeks for their use within Orthodox worship extends into at least the seventeenth century (and beyond it to the present day in the Ionian Islands). Thus in 1668 Patriarchs Paisios of Alexandria and Makarios of Antioch offered the following ruling about the liturgical propriety of Russian polyphony in Baroque styles (*partesnoye penie*):

Although it is not taken from the Eastern Church, but in this country [to which we have come] its use is disturbing to no one.⁸⁴

Western appreciation for Byzantine music may still be seen in the positive statements regarding Cretan chanting made by in the last two decades of the fifteenth century by a pair of German pilgrims on their way to the Holy Land.⁸⁵ A fundamental change of musical tastes made possible by the advent of music printing and the wide dissemination of new forms of polyphony, however, was already evident by the end of the next century when the Spanish composer Francisco Guerrero (1528–99) described the Greek chant he encountered on the island of Zakynthos as 'muy simple, e ignorante'.⁸⁶

Conclusion: Historical Narratives and the Sound of Orthodoxy

The preceding overview of musical relations between Greek and Latin Christians during the Middle Ages presents a picture that might be surprising to readers acquainted with the usual historical narratives of the two traditions' development. Whereas Greek Orthodox traditionalists and Western church musicians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries often found each other's style of singing repulsive, medieval Byzantines and Latins who otherwise disagreed strongly on any number of theological or aesthetic matters were able to appreciate – or at the very least, refrain

1995) (Argostoli, 2000), 57–65; Protopresbyter I. Mesoloras, 'Κεφαλληνιακή ἐκκλησιαστικὴ μουσικὴ', in *ibid.*, 187–99.

⁸⁴ Cited in A.V. Preobrazhenskii, 'Iz perykh let partesnago peniia v Moskve', *Muzikal'nyi sovremennik* 3 (Nov. 1915), 38–39; quoted and trans. in C. Jensen, *Nikolai Diletskii's 'Grammatika'* (Grammar) and the Musical Culture of Seventeenth-Century Muscovy, Ph.D. diss., Princeton University 1987, 78.

⁸⁵ Panagiotakes, *Μαρτυρίες*, 61.

⁸⁶ F. Guerrero, *El viage de Hierusalem* (Seville, 1592), R.P. Calcraft, ed., Exeter Hispanic Texts 37 (Exeter: University of Exeter, 1984), 16 (my thanks to Michael Christoforidis for this reference). Of course, it is possible that Guerrero simply walked into a church on a day when the service was being sung by a poorly trained cantor, an experience that I myself have had not infrequently in Greek Orthodox churches both in Europe and North America.

from condemning – the liturgical music of the other. Even during the centuries between the mutual excommunications of 1054 and the Ottoman conquest of 1453, music seems to have remained largely exempt from the tendency to make observable differences in Greek and Latin practice theologically significant. Its position is thus in many ways comparable to that of visual art, which has historically provided a great deal of common ground between Eastern and Western Christians,⁸⁷ but today is frequently the subject for Orthodox polemics launched by authors eager to repudiate the Italianate styles of iconography commonly used through the middle of the twentieth century to decorate Orthodox churches.⁸⁸

In the case of liturgical singing, we have observed significant areas of commonality through the end of the fifteenth century. Chief among these is that the divergence of styles employed in the most technically advanced works of Greek and Latin composers – respectively kalophonic chant and mensural polyphony – was long overshadowed statistically in the services of both traditions by the ancient central repertoires of Byzantine and Gregorian chant. Furthermore, it seems probable that the two traditions not only shared similar musical forms, but also remained aurally compatible. Arguing in favour of this suggestion are the transmission from East to West of certain chants and the theoretical framework of the Octoechos in the first millennium, the adoption of Italian polyphonic practices by Greek singers during the second millennium, and the aesthetically favourable reports of the medieval eyewitnesses quoted above.

One can perhaps better understand the latter by shedding inherited preconceptions regarding the proper sound of Christian chant, the ideals for which have varied significantly according to place and time. This is, of course, easier said than done, particularly today when the vibrant received tradition of Byzantine chanting possesses sonic attributes that are immediately recognisable and increasingly being adopted even by non-Greeks as an aural badge of Orthodoxy.⁸⁹ Fans of the testosterone-soaked

⁸⁷ Particularly illuminating in this regard are the following essays (with appended catalogue descriptions of particular artworks from the Metropolitan Museum of Art's recent exhibition) in H. C. Evans, ed., *Byzantium: Faith and Power (1261–1557)* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2004): 'Italy, the Mendicant Orders and the Byzantine Sphere', 449–88; M. Georgopoulou, 'Venice and the Byzantine Sphere', 489–514; R.S. Nelson, 'Byzantium and the Rebirth of Art and Learning in Italy and France', 515–44; and M.W. Ainsworth, "'À la façon grèce': The Encounter of Northern Renaissance Artists with Byzantine Icons', 545–593.

⁸⁸ T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, rev. edn (London: Penguin, 1993), 141–42.

⁸⁹ Although this broadly based phenomenon has yet to be studied systematically, examples of it include the re-Grecification of Romanian chanting by the choir of the Stavropoleos church in Bucharest, the application of the Byzantine drone (*ison*) to Znamenny chant by the monks of Valaam and the ubiquity throughout the Orthodox world of the

modern Greek cantorial scene, for example, would undoubtedly be more than a little shocked to hear the 'patriarchal vocal style' (*patriarchiko yphos*) of twelfth-century eunuchs.⁹⁰ By the same token, not a few listeners whose conception of Gregorian chant has been determined by the ethereal style of performance pioneered by the monks of Solesmes have reacted strongly against the recordings of Marcel Pérès,⁹¹ whose *Ensemble Organum* has taken seriously the scholarship suggesting that Roman chant and other music of the medieval West should be sonically 're-envisioned',⁹² perhaps even in the style of modern Greek Orthodox chanting.⁹³ Still, much has been achieved in recent decades as globalisation and the advent of World Music as a commercially viable product have diluted the hegemony of Western music. The successful tours and recordings of such artists as Theodoros Vassilicos, the Greek Byzantine Choir, Soeur Marie Keyrouz, the Romeiko Ensemble and Cappella Romana, together with the work of contemporary composers including Tavener, Ivan Moody, and Christos Hatzis, have fostered for Byzantine music a degree of acceptance among the Western public that would have been inconceivable a century ago to Terry and the employees of The Gramophone Company.⁹⁴

Marian carol '*Ἄγνη Παρθένε*' on a text by St Nektarios of Aegina (1846–1920), originally set to music by Fr Gregorios Simonopetrites (*Ψαλτήριον τέρπνον* [Mt. Athos: Holy Monastery of Simonos Petras, 1991], 637–40) but since translated into many other languages.

⁹⁰ A recent survey of eunuch singers in Byzantium is N. Moran, 'Byzantine castrati', *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 11, 2 (2002), 99–112. In recent years the website of the Association of Constantinopolitan Friends of Music in Athens (<http://www.cmkon.org>) has become a major promoter of the *patriarchiko yphos*.

⁹¹ Pérès has frequently collaborated with the Byzantine cantor Lykourgos Angelopoulos in his controversial recordings of Western medieval chant and polyphony. For the views of Pérès and several of his colleagues in other ensembles on the performance of medieval music, see B.D. Sherman, *Inside Early Music: Conversations with Performers* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 23–95.

⁹² Eg. P. Jeffrey, *Re-Envisioning Past Musical Cultures: Ethnomusicology and the Study of Gregorian Chant* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992). In *The Sound of Medieval Song: Ornamentation and Vocal Style According to the Treatises* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), T.J. McGee argues strongly that Latin plainchant was for many centuries audibly Mediterranean in its vocal style and ornamentation, making it thus sonically more akin to the received tradition of Byzantine chanting than to the sound of singers trained in modern Western conservatories.

⁹³ 'Furthermore, the guttural, forceful and vibrant delivery of Orthodox singers need not be ruled out as an impossibility for Western chant' (Hiley, 'Performing Practice, I, 2. Medieval Monophony', 352).

⁹⁴ Research for this article was supported by an Elizabeth and J. Richardson Dilworth Fellowship in the School of Historical Studies of the Institute for Advanced Study, an American Council of Learned Societies NEH/SSRC International and Area Studies Fellowship, and the Katherine K. Herberger College of Fine Arts at Arizona State University.